

REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 10, 20, and 28 are amended and claims 15, 18, 19, 21, 22, and 29-34 are canceled to place this application in condition for allowance. Currently, claims 10, 12, 14, 20, and 28 are before the Examiner.

In review, Applicant's attorney submitted proposed claims to Examiner Pianalto on September 9, 2004. In a telephone discussion on September 10, 2004, Examiner Pianalto indicated that claims 10 and 20 appeared to be distinguishable over the applied prior art, but did not believe that claims 15, 18, and 19 were in condition for allowance.

As a result of this interview, the product claims have been canceled from this application, leaving only the process and apparatus claims.

Turning to the rejections of record, Applicant submits the following summary of the arguments to support the patentability of claims 10 and 20.

Chamberlain

Chamberlain does not teach producing the substantially constant thickness material over substantially the entire media, nor does Chamberlain teach the supporting aspect of claim 10 or the partial magnetization of claims 10 and 20. Moreover, there is no reason why one would ever support an object on the adhesive of Chamberlain, or cover the entire box with adhesive.

Kasei

Kasei does not teach the use of a hot melt adhesive, the formation of a constant thickness adhesive using rollers, or the partial magnetization aspect of claims 10 and 20. Moreover, one of skill in the art would not be motivated by Chamberlain to use a hot melt adhesive in Kasei. The adhesive of Chamberlain is used to secure the tabs to the box. No such need exists in Kasei, and there would be no reason to use the adhesive of Chamberlain in Kasei unless one were to rely on the application of hindsight. Similarly, Kasei's uses knives to remove the bubbles formed in the adhesive when applied,

and one would not be motivated to use the claimed rollers and constant thickness application since there is no factual basis in the art to draw such a conclusion in this regard. To make such an allegation would be the impermissible use of hindsight.

In light of the Examiner's indication of the allowability of claims 10 and 20, and the cancellation of the product claims, this application is now in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to examine this application in light of this amendment and pass all pending claims onto issuance.

If the Examiner handling this application believes that an interview would help expedite allowance of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at 202-835-1753.

The above constitutes a complete response to all issues raised in the Office Action dated March 17, 2004. Again, reconsideration and allowance of this application is respectfully solicited.

Applicant petitions for a three month extension of time. **A check covering the \$475.00 extension of time fee is attached herewith**, however, please charge any fee deficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1088, including any extension of time fees and claim fees.

Again, reconsideration and allowance of this application is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
CLARK & BRODY

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Christopher W. Brody", written over a horizontal line.

Christopher W. Brody
Reg. No. 33,613

Customer No. 22902
1750 K Street, NW, Suite 600
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: 202-835-1753
Facsimile: 202-835-1111
Date: September 16, 2004